

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 28, 2004 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are independent. In this Amendment, claims 1-7 have been amended, no claims have been cancelled, and claim 8 has been added.

35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Hogle, IV (5,923,307). In order for a rejection under 35 USC § 102 to be valid the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present.

The disclosures of the cited art and the distinctions between them and applicant's claimed may be briefly summarized as follows:

Hogle IV teaches how to arrange multiple monitors in a logical space to form a contiguous, non-overlapping region.

Applicant's claimed invention (independent amended Claims 1, 4, and 7) is a method for displaying a perceived continuous image across two or more display areas, where each display area has a given resolution and the resolution of at least one display area is different than the resolution of the other display areas. The images provided to each display area are scaled such that when the images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and displayed resolution of at least one portion of

Amendment

the source image is different from the displayed resolution of at least one other portion of the source image.

Applicant's claimed invention (independent Claim 7) is a method for displaying a perceived continuous video image across first and second display areas where each display area has a given resolution and the resolution of one display area is different than the resolution of the other display area. The images provided to each display area are scaled such that when the images are displayed the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of the first video image on the first display is different from the displayed resolution of the second video image on the second display.

Hogle IV, does not, and indeed can not, scale an image to provide a continuous display with portions displayed in different resolutions. In Hogle IV, the total displayable screen area or virtual screen area is determined as an aggregate of the number of pixels contained in each of the screen areas. Hence when a screen area changes its resolution (for instance becoming larger by going to a size with more pixels such as 1024x768, or smaller by going to a size with fewer pixels such as 800x600) then the total displayable portion must be recalculated to either remove the overlap in the logical space caused by the larger screen size or to remove gaps in the logical space caused by the smaller screen size (please see column 11, lines 48-59). The effect of this is that if screens of differing pixel sizes are placed next to each other in logical space while an image overlapping the two screens will be displayed across the two screens and the image portions will be adjacent to each other, the entire image will not appear to be continuous as the portion of the image on the screen with the larger pixels will appear to be larger and the portion of the image on the screen with the smaller pixels will be smaller. The

Amendment

only way to insure a continuous image is to only use screens having the same pixel size. However, when this is done all images are displayed at the same resolution. Therefore, with Hogle IV your choice is to have either a perceived continuous image with one resolution of display or a discontinuous image using different resolutions.

This is quite different from Applicant's claimed invention which seeks to make use of screens with varying resolution capabilities and preserve a continuous image by appropriately scaling the images for each of the screens.

Therefore, as scaling the images to provide a continuous image with at least one portion displayed in a different resolution is not taught nor is it inherently present, each and every element is not taught and Hogle IV does not meet the requirements of a valid rejection under 35 USC § 102. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection be removed and submits that Applicant's independent claims 1, 4, and 7 are now in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Insofar as claims 2 and 5 are concerned, these claims all include the limitations of and depend from now presumably allowable claims 1 or 4 and are also believed to be in allowable condition for the reasons hereinbefore discussed with regard to claims 1 and 4 above.

35 USC § 103

Claims 3 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogle IV.

Amendment

The disclosures of the cited art and the distinctions between them and applicant's claimed may be briefly summarized as follows:

Hogle IV teaches how to arrange multiple monitors in a logical space to form a contiguous, non-overlapping region.

Applicant's claimed invention (claims 3 and 6) is a method for displaying a perceived continuous image across two or more display areas, where each display area has a given and given resolution of at least one display area is different than the resolution of the other display areas. The images provided to each display area are scaled such that when the images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image but the image displayed one of the display areas will be of a different resolution to the image displayed one the other display areas.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

It is well settled that the prior art must enable one skilled in the art to make and use the apparatus or method and that obviousness also requires evidence that the prior art as a whole would have enabled someone of

Amendment

ordinary skill to practice the claimed invention. Hogle IV does not teach or suggest scaling an image to provide a continuous display with portions displayed in different resolutions. In Hogle IV, the total displayable screen area or virtual screen area is determined as an aggregate of the number of pixels contained in each of the screen areas. Hence when a screen area changes its resolution (for instance becoming larger by going to a size with more pixels such as 1024x768, or smaller by going to a size with fewer pixels such as 800x600) then the total displayable portion must be recalculated to either remove the overlap in the logical space caused by the larger screen size or to remove gaps in the logical space caused by the smaller screen size (please see column 11, lines 48-59). The effect of this is that if screens of differing pixel sizes are placed next to each other in logical space while an image overlapping the two screens will be displayed across the two screens and the image portions will be adjacent to each other, the entire image will not appear to be continuous as the portion of the image on the screen with the larger pixels will appear to be larger and the portion of the image on the screen with the smaller pixels will be smaller. The only way to insure a continuous image is to only use screens having the same pixel size. However, when this is done all images are displayed at the same resolution. Therefore, with Hogle IV your choice is to have either a perceived continuous image with one resolution of display or a discontinuous image using different resolutions.

This is quite different from Applicant's claimed invention which seeks to make use of screens with varying resolutions and preserve a continuous image with at least one portion displayed at a different resolution, regardless of the resolution of any individual screen by appropriately scaling the images for each of the screens. Therefore Hogle IV does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, there is no suggestion to modify Hogle IV

Amendment

to provide the suggestion limitation and without more there can not be fairly said to be a reasonable expectation of success. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and Claims 3 and 6 be allowed to issue.

Reconsideration/Admittance Requested

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited.

Fee Authorization And Extension Of Time Statement

No additional fee due to an Extension of Time is believed to be required for this amendment, however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney (or agent) hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Nola Mae McBain, at Telephone Number 650-812-4264, Palo Alto, California.

Respectfully submitted,



Nola Mae McBain
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 35,782
(650) 812-4264

Palo Alto, California
Date: 9/28/2004

Amendment